

clear indication of the new majority's inability to even address the most basic environmental concerns.

This legislation recognizes the ongoing work that State and private folks have done to protect Yellowstone geothermal features while still providing clear direction and a legal framework to build on these various efforts. This legislation is the result of legislative efforts begun in the 1988 amendments to the Geothermal Steam Lease Act. That legislation established a list of geothermal resources that should not be allowed to be developed under this Nation's steam leasing laws. Yellowstone was the most threatened of these cultural sites and it was chosen as a test case for protection.

Since that time State and Federal officials have worked toward a cooperative way of protecting Yellowstone thermal wonders. All concerned agree that although gains have been made this legislation presented today is keenly necessary to complete our pledge to provide rock-ribbed, ironclad, copper-riveted protection for Yellowstone's geysers, and hot pots.

The legislation also provides a pattern for the protection of other geothermal treasures such as Crater Lake in Oregon. This legislation is a bipartisan proposal that has complete support from the State governments adjacent to the park and it shares environmental support with no known development concern.

The land exchange that is attached to the bill removes the only permit, given in any State, for drilling hot water adjacent to Yellowstone. The exchange provides solutions to access problems while granting to the Government hundreds of claims to hot water in the Corwin Springs KGRA. Public access in general is improved to federal land and the Church Universal and Triumphant is provided a welcome solution to their longstanding inholding problems.

This exchange solves a problem created by the time it has taken to address this issue and is luckily the only problem that currently exists. Failure to act will only make a final solution more difficult. Wrongheaded ideology is all that stands in the way of true statutory protection for Yellowstone and Old Faithful.

I hope we will move quickly to save the last intact geyser basin in the world. It is our duty to do so.

#### A TRIBUTE TO THE NEEDLES MUSTANGS

#### HON. JERRY LEWIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, January 27, 1995*

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to bring to your attention today a remarkable group of individuals who recently made the citizens of Needles, CA particularly proud. I am speaking of the Needles High School varsity football team—the Mustangs—who will be remembered not for their record but for the fact that they played like champions all season. To me, and many others, they are winners in every sense of the word.

The Mustangs, who started the season with only 18 players, worked extremely hard to represent their school but suffered a number of heartbreaking injuries during the season. In fact, in one game, 9 members of the team played every single play of the game on of-

fense and defense because injuries left the team with only 13 players dressed to play. For most of the season, the squad was outmanned, undersized, and overwhelmed by larger schools. But the Mustangs never quit. They fought hard and, more importantly, played with heart, winning the respect of their families, opposing coaches, and the entire community.

It would have been easy for these kids to give up going into their last game of the season winless. But they didn't. Because they would not ever quit, the Mustangs fought for every yard and persevered in the face of adversity, winning a hard fought contest, 25 to 18. When the final gun had sounded, one would have thought they had won the Super Bowl. I guess in many respects they did. Most inspiring was the fact that these young men, all from different ethnic and cultural backgrounds, demonstrated what it means to work together, to continue to work hard, and to never give up. Their committee, courage, and determination provides an example for us all to admire, and emulate. They are our greatest hope for the future of Needles and the future of our country. To me, and the many people who make Needles their home, it was truly a championship year.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join me, our colleagues, and the many friends of the Needles Mustangs in recognizing their commitment to winning on and off the field. They have taught all of us many things and are certainly worthy of recognition by the House today.

#### AN AGREEMENT WORTH PRESERVING

#### HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, January 27, 1995*

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, as you know, North Korea's efforts to acquire a nuclear weapons arsenal constitute one of the most serious national security threats facing the United States today.

Last October, Ambassador-at-Large Robert I. Gallucci negotiated an agreement with North Korea that holds out the promise of freezing and eventually eliminating North Korea's nuclear weapons program. The Congress may face no more pressing national security issue in all of 1995 than whether to permit the implementation of this accord.

Unfortunately, there exists considerable confusion about this agreement, and the press has contained a number of erroneous statements as to what this agreement does and does not permit.

Six months ago, we were on the verge of a confrontation with North Korea—a confrontation no one wanted, and which held little possibility of addressing our concerns about North Korea's nuclear program. Today, however, as a result of the Geneva agreement, Pyongyang has frozen its nuclear program and agreed to a step-by-step process that will eventually eliminate that program.

North Korea in already taken a number of significant steps under the accord, in advance in any United States concessions. The North has already shut down its only operating reactor. It has already halted construction on two new reactors. It has already sealed its repro-

cessing facility and stopped construction on a new reprocessing line. It has already refrained from reprocessing its spent fuel rods, which would have given the North enough plutonium for four or five nuclear weapons. And it has already admitted IAEA inspectors and U.S. technicians into its nuclear facilities.

By accepting the record, Pyongyang has agreed not only to resume IAEA inspections of its nuclear facilities, but to go beyond its obligations under the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty [NPT]. It has agreed, for instance, to forego reprocessing the spent fuel it presently possesses, and to shut down its reprocessing facility—even though the NPT permits reprocessing. And without reprocessing, the North will not be able to obtain the plutonium required for the manufacture of nuclear weapons.

Mr. Speaker, this agreement is not based on trust. It is not based on promises. It is based solely on North Korea's performance. The United States retains its ability, both through IAEA inspections and through its own national means, to verify if the North is abiding by its commitments. And if, at any time, we conclude that Pyongyang is not living up to its end of the bargain, we can back out of the deal.

The alternative to this agreement is not a better agreement. The only real alternatives are to return to the United Nations to ask for economic sanctions that no one believes will succeed, or an escalation to war.

But with this agreement, we have an accord that diminishes tensions on the Korean peninsula. An accord that protects our security interests and those of our allies. An accord that advances our global nonproliferation objectives. An accord that obligates other to pick up the overwhelming bulk of the financial costs.

Mr. Speaker, this is what I call a good bargain. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to inform themselves about this agreement and to support its implementation.

#### CONTROLLING THE DEFICIT

#### HON. THOMAS M. FOGLIETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, January 27, 1995*

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Speaker, I share with my colleagues a grave concern for gaining control of the deficit because it stifles our national economic growth. I question the way to get there. Let me explain.

During the debate on a balanced budget, we watched Members vote for a balanced budget amendment that would protect Social Security. Others voted for a version of the amendment that would strip supermajority provisions for increasing debt limit and raising taxes, but would require a balanced budget in 7 years. Still others have urged the proponents of these measures to identify the specific cuts needed to balance the budget, but would still favor a balanced budget in 7 years, notwithstanding how cruel the answers to the plea for a balanced budget plan would be.

Allow me to state my position clearly. I do not support an arbitrary balanced budget amendment, by a certain year, to the U.S. Constitution which provides no flexibility to meet other vital national goals. I do favor a

balanced budget amendment which would establish the kind of capital budget which States and cities now have. This enables them to balance their budgets, while also providing enough dollars to preserve the safety net, keep programs to further economic growth and maintain infrastructure. This kind of borrowing is both responsible and manageable; it could better ensure a decent standard of living for all Americans, regardless of income.

We need to achieve fiscal responsibility. But more importantly, we cannot destroy the security of millions of vulnerable and disadvantaged Americans that rely upon the safety net to keep their families alive.

#### SETTING THE RECORD STRAIGHT ON THE PROTECTION OF AMERICA'S SENIOR CITIZENS

**HON. ANDREA H. SEASTRAND**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, January 27, 1995*

Mrs. SEASTRAND. Mr. Speaker, I suppose I should be honored that the Democrats' chief attack dog, Mr. BONIOR, chose to use me as an example in promulgating one of his party's favorite factual errors—the Republican position on Social Security.

Just in case Mr. BONIOR and the Democrat campaign committees have misunderstood, let me be clear. As long as I am a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives, I will fight any effort to touch Social Security.

Unfortunately, the Democrats are continuing with vigor their failed campaign message that Republicans were out to hurt senior citizens and destroy Social Security.

If the American people did not fall for these absurd scare tactics during the recent midterm elections, what makes the Democrats think they will fall for it now? You would think that the new minority party in Congress would have gotten the message.

The facts are quite clear. The Republican Contract With America specifically states that Social Security is off the table. Republican leaders and Republican Members have stated repeatedly that the budget can be balanced by the year 2002—without touching Social Security—simply by restraining the growth in Federal spending to 3 percent annually as opposed to the scheduled 5.4 percent increase.

The basic and unspoken problem that Mr. BONIOR and his liberal colleagues have with the Republican contract is its commitment to rein in out-of-control Federal spending. What this clearly illustrates to even the most casual observers is the Democrats' total unwillingness to reduce Government spending.

Mr. Speaker, in 1993 the Clinton Democrats passed the largest tax increase in history, and one of the things they conveniently forget about this tax increase is how much it hurt America's seniors. The 1993 tax bill cut Medicare by \$85 billion and slapped \$25 billion in higher taxes on Social Security beneficiaries. Had the Clinton-Gephardt health care bill passed the Congress, it would have slashed Medicare by more than \$400 billion over 10 years and limited the program to zero growth.

By contrast the Republican contract's Senior Citizens Equity Act, which I have cosponsored, helps senior citizens. This bill, H.R. 8, includes provisions to raise the Social Security earnings limit to \$30,000 over 5 years; repeal

the Clinton tax increases on Social Security retirees; and provide tax incentives for the purchase of private long-term care insurance.

Mr. Speaker, the reality is that the Republican proposals outlined in the Contract With America are designed to help older Americans and undo the damage created by the Clinton Democrats. I am afraid that the Democrats' best efforts to scare older Americans into thinking otherwise will fail just as miserably as it did during the 1994 elections.

#### INTERNATIONAL CUSTOMS DAY, JANUARY 26, 1953

**HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, January 27, 1995*

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, 42 years ago on January 26, 1953, the World Customs Organization formally known as the Customs Cooperation Council, held its first meeting in Brussels, Belgium. In recognition of this occasion, the council observes January 26 as International Customs Day. Additionally, this occasion is also being used to give recognition to customs services around the world in view of the significant role they play in producing national revenue and in protecting national borders from economically and physically harmful importations.

Mr. Speaker, I am particularly proud of our U.S. Customs Service for its invaluable contributions to the Nation over the past 206 years of its existence. U.S. Customs was once the sole revenue producer for the young United States and its role in revenue collection continues: in fiscal year 1994 Customs collected a record \$22.9 billion in revenue. In addition, Customs has taken on other important responsibilities such as interdicting narcotics at our borders, preventing the exportation of critical technology, and enforcing the regulations of more than 40 Government agencies.

The U.S. Customs Service represents the United States at the Customs Cooperation Council [CCC], a 136-member international organization founded to facilitate international trade and promote cooperation between governments on customs matters. The CCC works to simplify and standardize legal instruments and rules of international customs. The CCC also renders technical assistance in areas such as customs tariffs, valuation, nomenclature, and law enforcement. Its objective is to obtain, in the interest of international trade, the best possible degree of uniformity among the customs systems of member nations. The United States became a member on November 5, 1970. All America benefits when both exporters and importers operate in an atmosphere of simple unambiguous customs operations around the world.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the Customs Cooperation Council with regard to its past accomplishments and for its ambitious goals of further harmonizing and simplifying those customs rules which affect international commerce. In addition, I congratulate our U.S. Customs Service for its outstanding work both nationally and internationally.

#### PROPOSING A BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

SPEECH OF

**HON. MIKE WARD**

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 25, 1995*

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.J. Res. 1) proposing a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. WARD. Mr. Chairman, one of the most important votes of my career will be cast during my third week as Kentucky's Third District Representative. That vote, Mr. Speaker, will be my vote on the proposed balanced budget constitutional amendment.

It would be easy to follow the advice of the pollsters and political consultants—the easy, politically smart vote is probably to vote for this amendment.

But, the people of the Third District expect me to study the issues carefully and to vote for the long-term best interest of our community and our Nation. Sometimes, this will require me to cast a politically difficult vote.

The balanced budget amendment appears to be such a vote.

Anyone who reads Wall Street Journal editorials knows that you will rarely find a more conservative viewpoint, nor one more devoted to reducing the size of government and reducing taxes. But, on November 18, 1994—a few days after the Republican's election landslide—the Wall Street Journal carried an important editorial headlined "Balance By Amendment?"

Here is what the Wall Street Journal editorial had to say about the proposed balanced budget amendment:

While we yield to none in wanting a smaller government and have been big backers of the line-item veto and the like, we've always had our doubts about the budget amendment idea. While politically appealing, it makes no particular sense economically. We fret that it will prove the Republican equivalent of the Democratic health care proposal—playing well in polls and focus groups but falling apart when you try to write a law.

To understand the economics, start here: If all American households were required to balance their budgets every year, no one could ever buy a house \* \* \*

\* \* \* Ultimately, the pertinent question about government borrowing is the same as it is for households or corporations. How large is the debt compared to available resources, and for what purpose are the proceeds spent?

While no single statistic can capture the reality, one of the best measures is the trend of outstanding debt as a proportion of yearly output \* \* \* Debt was more than 100 percent of GDP (gross domestic product) at the end of World War II, declined to around a quarter in 1974, and then grew to more than half today. We would certainly argue that winning the World War was worth borrowing 100% of GDP, and winning the Cold War was worth borrowing 50 percent \* \* \*

\* \* \* crude goals (such as outright budget balance) tend to impose large short-run costs, in political pain and economic dislocation. \* \* \* Perhaps in their current euphoria Republicans feel confident about this question (that a balanced budget amendment will be sustainable), but our advice is that they should look before they leap.